

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9, 13-15 and 19-21 were pending in this application. Claims 3, 6, 10-12 and 16-19 were cancelled. Support for the amendments can be found in the claims as originally filed, and in Figures 21 and 23. For the reasons stated below, Applicant submits that all claims presently pending in this application, as amended, are in condition for allowance.

In the office Action dated May 28, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 7-9, 15 and 21 under 35 USC § 112; claims 1-2 and 7-9 under 35 USC § 102(b)/103(a) as anticipated by or obvious over McEwen, U.S. Patent No. 4,469,099; claim 5 as obvious over McEwen in view of Bungert, U.S. Patent No. 4,984,579; and claims 13-15 and 19-21 as unpatentable over McEwen and Englehardt, U.S. Patent No. 4,831,242

To the extent that these rejections might still be applied to the claims currently pending in this application, they are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration of the claims as presently amended is earnestly solicited.

### Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

With regard to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 7-9, 15 and 21 to overcome these objection. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under §§ 102 And 103**

Claims 1-2, 4 and 7-9

These claims were rejected as anticipated or obvious over McEwen. On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to separate two components (input means and controller unit) within a system, since it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill. This assertion simply misses the point: the limitation does not recite having separate components; instead, it recites that the first input means is adapted to be freely attached to and removed from the main body. Clearly, that is a different structure from a structure in which the first input means is separate from the main body, but it cannot be freely attached to and removed from the main body. This difference is important, because, as explained in the application at paragraphs [0025], [0032] and [0042], this allows only persons having authorization to set the critical pressure and time parameters.

Moreover, there is no suggestion or disclosure in McEwen of a structure that would require that the critical parameters be set only by persons having the authorization to do so, as explained in paragraphs [0025] and [0032], to ensure the safety of the training method (paragraph [0042]).

In view of the foregoing all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions or determine that any further action is desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Serial No.: 10/568,352  
Art Unit: 3764  
Inventor: Yoshiaki SATO

Attorney's Docket No.: SUZ0027-US  
Page 13

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP  
875 15th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Tel: 202/551-1700

Respectfully submitted,

YOSHIAKI SATO

Date: November 23, 2009

By:



Aslan Baghdadi

Registration No. 34,542

AB/hjm

Customer No. 36183